DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 293 CE 067 450

TITLE	Creating Greater Incentives for Joint Planning and Collaboration between Occupational Education and Job Training.
INSTITUTION	Nevada State Council on Occupational Education, Carson City.
PUB DATE	May 92
NOTE	11p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Role; Articulation (Education); *Cooperative Planning; *Coordination; Educational Cooperation; Educational Legislation; Educational Planning; *Incentives; *Job Training; Partnerships in Education; Position Papers; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; State Agencies; State Federal Aid; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Nevada

ABSTRACT

The Nevada Council on Occupational Education (NCOE) recommends that the following agencies/organizations continue to bear responsibility for third-party (private sector) assessment and monitoring of vocational education and job training programs in Nevada: State Job Training Partnership Coordinating Council, private industry councils, state technical committees, and the State Council on Vocational Education. The NCOE further endorses retention of Nevada's current planning process and supports the development of a Human Resource Investment Council (HRIC) to be chaired by the governor or a designee and to include the state-level administrators of 10 federal vocational education, job training, and employment programs funded under 12 acts, including the following: Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, Job Training Partnership Act, Adult Education Act, Social Security Act (Title IV), Emergency Immigrant Education Act, and Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. The HRIC should develop a coordination plan that includes the following: written cooperative agreement for use with participating agencies/governing authorities, description of all common participant goals for all federally supported human resource development efforts, uniform definitions of program participant eligibility, granting process, program funding priorities, and program evaluation process. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 293

Nevada Council on Occupational Education

1802 N. Carson Street, No. 212 • Carson City, Nevada 89701 • Phone 702/882-7112 FAX 702/882-7113

OFFICERS

President
Jeanne Jones
Las Vegas

Vice-President
Douglas Burris, Ph.D
Reno

Second Vice-President
David Howard
Reno

Charlene Rogerson
Las Vegas

Members

Erik Beyer
Reno

Claudette Enus
Las Vegas

Ted Finneran
Laughlin

Kathleen Frosini
Las Vegas

Floyd "Wayne" Grimes
Las Vegas

John Mathews
Pioche

Clifford McClain, Ph.D.
Las Vegas

Phillip "Pancho" Williams
Reno

Staff

Michael L. Rask, Ph.D.
Executive Director

Rose Mary Johnson
Administrative Assistant

CE 067450

CREATING GREATER INCENTIVES FOR JOINT PLANNING AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND JOB TRAINING

MAY 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M L Rask

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SECTION V

Creating Greater Incentives For Joint Planning And Collaboration Between Occupational Education and Job Training

The Carl D. Perkins Act in its direction to the State Council charges the Council, as a majority private sector advisory body, with making recommendations for improving collaboration, and thus coordination among education, employment and job training programs. Incompatibilities in program management, and the administrative authorities of state level agencies in Nevada have been stumbling stones to development of an "ideal" coordination environment. From 1981-1991 the State Council has observed, commented on, and made recommendations to the State Board of Education on the status of coordination among agencies. In 1981, the State Council reported that little or no deliberate coordination was being achieved. The Council cited a lack of consistent data between vocational education and job training programs as a major problem in making comparisons among programs. In 1985, the Council reported a significant increase in coordination resulting from a common database being generated through the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and Employment Security Department.

From 1985 through 1989, the Council noted a significant growth in cooperation between Occupational Education and Job Training at the state and local level. The increase in communications was in part due to the requirement of the Federal Vocational Education Act for the State Plan for Vocational Education to be submitted to the State Job Training Coordination Council (JTCC), and State Job Training Office, for review and comment prior to State Board of Education approval. The review of the vocational education state plan by the Job Training community trickled down to the Local Educational Agencies requiring their local applications be reviewed by the JTPA Private Industry Councils representatives.

While there is still no specific requirements for Job Training Partnerships Act program managers to share planning and priorities with the educational community, interagency cooperation has continually increased. Today, cross representation on both occupational education and job training councils and committees does exist on state and local levels. Occupational educators serve on each Private Industry Council (PIC) in the state, and representatives of the PIC serve on the technical committees of all of the community colleges and three school districts.

The coordination of services can best be highlighted by the jointly funded Single Parent and Homemakers Centers. Even today, coordination is dependent most upon the commitment of the

individual program administrators' willingness to share program information and receive comments and advice.

Nevada is still unable to address the training needs, and thus, the business of the State. In 1991 all available training and occupational education programs fell short of meeting the labor demand by approximately 63% based upon the Labor Supply and Demand Report of 1991.

THOUGH THE PROGRESS ON PROGRAM COORDINATION HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANT OVER THE LAST 10 YEARS, DECLINING STATE FUNDS FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND INCREASED DEMAND FOR A SKILLED WORKFORCE DEMANDS FORMALIZATION OF THE COORDINATION EFFORT AT THE STATE LEVEL. The formalization of coordination should result in greater efficiency in terms of both use of funds and student/client services.

"TOWARD COORDINATION"

The Position Of
The Nevada Council on Occupational Education

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the greatest challenge faced by this nation's education and training system is the responsibility of preparing this nation's workforce. We are constantly "told" that we are not producing what is needed -- that we are failing this country's business and industry as well as its people.

What appears to be missing at both the national and state level is a set of strategic goals for human resource development. Within recent months three major national reports have been released, "America 2000", the "SCANS Report", and "America's Choice". While none of these documents claim to be a strategic plan nor a set of strategic goals for this nation's human resource development needs, they do address the issue.

At the same time Congress and the Nevada Legislature continue to deal with various pieces of federal and state legislation which address various "pieces" of human resource development. Coordination of programs continues to be a consideration in these dealings.

The Nevada Council on Occupational Education believes that in order for effective coordination to occur, this nation and Nevada must develop a set of strategic goals for human resource development. Once these goals have been identified each of the entities involved in human resource development can then effectively develop their individual plans to achieve these goals. For secondary occupational education in Nevada, the Secondary Course of Study is a coordinated beginning.

The passage of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-392) more closely aligned the program and population priorities of vocational education and job training. Congress clearly expressed its priorities in terms of youth and adults who are found to be most at-risk in our society. The distribution and use of funds prioritize handicapped and economically disadvantaged individuals within the secondary education system and within the service areas of our postsecondary and technical institutions.

The proposed Job Training Partnership Act Amendments of 1991, as presented in H.R.3033 and S.2055, focus on the working poor, socially dependent, and individuals whose basic skills result in structural unemployment. Like the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (VATEA),

H.R.3033 proposes measuring the success of programs in terms of performance standards revised to include basic skills, employment competencies, employment standards, long-term employability, job placement and retention. There are similarities in the service populations and program goals, but looking beyond the surface, you realize the significant differences in the Acts.

A coordinated job training and occupational education system is essential if America is to hold its position in the global economy. Since 1981, Congress, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Departments of Education and Labor have questioned the viability of efforts to coordinate vocational education and training programs at the State level. A review of of the State Council's reports from 1981 to 1991 reveal significant discussion on the structural and administrative problems of coordinating occupational education and JTPA programs.

Reports from the Federal Administration's Office of Management and Budget, as well as State Councils, indicate that the range of coordination is from no coordination, to effective joint efforts. In spite of these reports the OMB conclusion is that there is no coordination occurring. Recent, as well as, current actions of Congress confirm that the coordination language in legislation is based upon several assumptions including:

1. The states will not put their coordination "house" in order;

2. The establishment of a Human Resource Investment Council (HRIC) will improve service, provide performance, and eliminate duplication of effort;

3. Federally supported programs designed to assist in the development of an educated and employment-ready workforce have not coordinated their programs nor cooperated to the extent necessary to be most effective; and

4. State and local funds committed to programs similar to the federal vocational and training programs will follow the federal dollar into new priorities.

A PROPOSED COORDINATION DESIGN SERVING THE CONCERNS OF CONGRESS

As functional responsibilities of society, training and education have different designs and methodology, even though they share many common goals related to the employability of individuals. It can be said that occupational education and training share the common goal of employment, but policy establishment must be a function of institutions which provide

participant services. Those portions of education and training which coincide (i.e. job placement) must be coordinated if the broader social need is to be met and the national priority of economic efficiency is to be reached. A higher level of coordinated services must be achieved. Declining State revenues for vocational education and training demand a more effective system in Nevada.

Programs operated under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Wagner-Peyser Act are programs whose major contribution are made through federal appropriations. Programs like JTPA are relatively self-sufficient based upon the federal funds. The loss of state level contributions would mean little to the overall program initiative of JTPA.

Education, however, is heavily dependent upon state and local contributions to provide broad-based programming. The federal, state and local funds combined make a significant pool of funds in support of occupational education. If federal funds in support of occupational education are shifted from the education governance to job training, it cannot be assumed that the state and local funds will be shifted. Splintering the funds will result in a small pool of dollars available to support public occupational education. Federal educational contributions to programs cannot stand alone and must remain within the policy influence and priority setting of the education community.

The federal role has always been, and should remain, to leverage state and local funds to drive a state education system to the resolution of national problems. If the federal employment education contribution is removed from the balance of the state's effort, the loss will be the traditional leveraging of state and local funds through federal leadership and enactment. If two policies and priorities exist for occupational education, one for federally funded efforts and one for state and local supported efforts, the end result will be a significant loss of programs, a decline of program improvement efforts, and a de-emphasis on the needs of special populations.

A functional model for coordination currently exists and has operated successfully at the state level. The model is the governing committee of the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.

At a time when the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, America 2000, the SCANS Report, and the preamble to the Job Training Partnership Act reauthorization is calling for greater involvement of the private sector, is it wise to reduce that involvement? If the structure of the Human Resource Investment Council as proposed in current Federal legislation is pursued, one could expect significant resistance from program administrators. Secondly, the added value of private sector participation will be diminished as the number of

private sector representatives proposed is greatly reduced from the current numbers on the State Job Training and Occupational Education Councils.

The HRIC as proposed by Congress is, in fact, a policy council because it establishes the provision of services, the use of funds and resources, and methods of coordination. While the common goal of preparation for employment must be coordinated and unified, the establishment of educational policy, resource priorities, and state standards for educational programs must remain with the education community. The same is true for training programs: policy, priorities and standards for training programs must remain in the training community.

A MODEL FOR MORE EFFECTIVE COORDINATION

The establishment of a HRIC is essential for the development of America's workforce. The HRIC should follow the successful model established by the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees. True coordination and policy codification for diverse programs can only be accomplished when the state level program administrators are drawn together with common service goals.

For ten years State Councils on Vocational Education have analyzed the effectiveness of coordination between JTPA and Vocational Education. This analysis clearly demonstrates that State level administrators, not policy boards or advisory committees, are the central figures in effective coordination.

A Human Resource Investment Council should be composed of State level administrators for:

A. The Job Training Partnership Act
B. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act
C. The Adult Education Act
D. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973
E. The Wagner-Peyser Act
F. Title IV of the Social Security Act (JOBS)
G. Section 6 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977
H. The Higher Education Act
I. The State Economic Development Agency
J. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act
K. The Emergency Immigrant Education Act
L. The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act

The HRIC should be chaired by the Governor or the Governor's designee, not eligible under the administrators categories. Each council member should expend funds from their state administrative set-aside to support the operational costs of the HRIC.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It should be the responsibility of the HRIC to develop and administer a Coordination Plan. The Coordination Plan would be developed by the HRIC, and therefore, those individuals administratively capable of making change in each of the program plans and/or contracts. The Coordination Plan should include the following:

A. A written cooperative agreement for use with participating agencies governing authorities;
B. A description of all common participant goals (i.e. job placement, career exploration, placement services, etc.) for all federally supported human resource development efforts;
C. A description of current activities conducted regardless of funding source(s);
D. Where common goals exist and program standards are established, uniform definitions of program participant eligibility should be used when like sources of funds are available to serve such participants;
E. Development of a granting process within the state which will guarantee common distribution of grant proposal information;
F. A priority for funding of programs that demonstrate operations in support of common goals and the use of multiple funding sources;
G. Development of an evaluation process which should be used to evaluate programs that have been coordinated with the HRIC.

The detailed processes described in each Act affected by this coordination concept and the content of each Act's plans and contracts cannot be developed under the auspices of the HRIC regardless of composition. The current Job Training Partnership Act and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act have prescribed involvement by the private sector to serve the planning and policy needs of each system.

At a time when business and industry across America is struggling for its very existence, education and training cannot afford to reduce their involvement. Education, labor, and business is emphasizing broad-based private sector involvement in establishing program policy. Expanding private sector involvement is critical to the development of the workforce.

Each of the Federal Acts discussed has directed the recipient of funds from the Acts to coordinate services. Therefore, it is the program administrators who must provide coordination leadership.

The policy, planning, administration, and advisory structures described within the existing six Federal Acts have served well. It would be ill-advised to dismantle an effective system of operations to bring about the coordination of programs.

QUICK REFERENCE AND RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

ENDORSEMENT 1

Responding to the ever increasing call of business and industry involvement in reports like America 2000, and the purposes of the JTPA and the Carl D. Perkins Act, the Nevada Council endorses the continuance of the State Job Training Partnership Coordinating Council, Private Industry Councils, State Technical Committees, and the State Council on Vocational Education. This structure was created by Congress to provide for third party (private sector) assessment, recommendations, and reporting for the improvement of programs.

ENDORSEMENT 2

Ensuring the programmatic integrity Congress intended in each Federal Act, the Nevada Council endorses the retention of the current planning process and supports the development of the Human Resource Investment Council (HRIC).

RECOMMENDATION 1

After researching the recommendations made by the Nevada State Council on the effectiveness of coordination between the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and vocational education since 1981, the Nevada Council supports the concept of a Human

Resource Investment Council (HRIC) composed of the state level administrators of:

A. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act
B. The Job Training Partnership Act
C. The Adult Education Act
D. The Wagner-Peyser Act
E. Title IV of the Social Security Act (JOBS)
F. Section 6 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977
G. The Higher Education Act
H. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act
I. The Emergency Immigrant Education Act
J. The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act

The HRIC should be chaired by the Governor or the Governor's designee, not eligible under administrative categories. Each member of the HRIC should be authorized to expend funds from their state administrative set-aside to support the operational costs of the HRIC.

RECOMMENDATION 2

It shall be the responsibility of the HRIC to develop and monitor a Coordination Plan. The Coordination Plan will be developed by the HRIC, and therefore, those individuals administratively capable of making change in each of the related program plans and/or contracts.

The Coordination Plan should include the following:

A. The HRIC shall develop a written cooperative agreement for use with participating agencies governing authorities;
B. A description of all common participant goals (i.e. job placement, career exploration, placement services, etc.) for all federally supported human resource development efforts;
C. A description of current activities conducted regardless of funding source(s);
D. Where common goals exist and program standards are established, uniform definitions of program participant eligibility shall be used when like sources of funds are available to serve such participants;
E. Development of a granting process within the state which will guarantee common distribution of grant proposal information;
F. A priority for funding of programs that demonstrate operations in support of multiple funding sources; and
G. Development of an evaluation process which should be used to evaluate programs that have been coordinated with the HRIC.